

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE HONORABLE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re the Application of

David C. Robinson, et al.

Confirmation No.: 1407

Application No.: 10/014,637

Examiner: GRANT II, Jerome

Filed: October 26, 2001

Docket No.: D/A0613Q
XERZ 2 01061

Title: JOB SUBMISSION SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR CONTROLLING
MULTIPLE JOB RENDERINGS WITH A SINGLE MASTER OR "SUPER"
TICKET

RESPONSE TO NOTIFICATION OF
NON-COMPLIANT APPEAL BRIEF

Appeal from Group 2625

Patrick R. Roche, Esq., Reg. No. 29,580
FAY SHARPE LLP
1100 Superior Avenue – Seventh Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
Telephone: (216) 861-5582
Attorneys for Appellants

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence (and any item referred to herein as being attached or enclosed) is (are) being transmitted to the USPTO by electronic transmission via the EFS Web on the date indicated below.

June 19, 2008
Date



Name: Cathryn Terchek

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST	1
II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES	2
III. STATUS OF CLAIMS	3
IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS	4
V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.....	5
VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL	12
VII. ARGUMENT	13
A. The Claims Define Nonobvious Subject Matter.....	17
VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX	23
IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX	30
X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX.....	31

This Appeal Brief is in furtherance to the Notice of Appeal regarding the above-referenced patent application that was electronically filed in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on November 16, 2007.

The fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.17 and any required petition for extension of time for filing this brief and fees therefor are addressed in the accompanying transmittal of Appeal Brief.

Appellant files this Appeal Brief in connection with the above-identified application wherein claims 1-8, 10, 11 and 28-38 were finally rejected in the Final Office Action that was mailed May 16, 2007.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest for this appeal and the present application is Xerox Corporation (Xerox Square – 20A, Rochester, New York 14644), by way of an Assignment recorded in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office at Reel 012382, Frame 0200.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Currently, it is believed that there are no prior or pending appeals, interferences or judicial proceedings, known to Appellant, Appellant's representative, or the Assignee, that may be related to, or which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing upon the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

The status of the claims set forth in the Final Office Action mailed May 16, 2007 was, and is, as follows:

Claims 1-8, 10, 11 and 28-38 are rejected.

Claims 9, 12-27, 39-49 are canceled.

The present appeal is directed specifically to claims 1-8, 10, 11 and 28-38.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

An Amendment After Final Rejection was filed on October 31, 2007. By an Advisory Action dated December 11, 2007, it was indicated that the requested amendments were not entered.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The present application is directed toward document processing systems for controlling print jobs comprised of multiple renderings of the same image data more efficiently than is taught in the prior art. It is common that an individual form of image data, e.g., a presentation, is desired to be printed in alternative forms, on alternative media. With reference to Figure 1, it can be seen that one generic job can be formatted in four different renderings, i.e., handouts, slides, note sets, proof sets. In a most inefficient scenario, the user would separately program the printing system for each particular rendering and the printing system would sequentially process the jobs individually and independently. In the example of Figure 1, wherein handouts, slides and a note set are desired, each rendering has its own "job ticket" (defined at page 3, lines 4-13). The different renderings per se require different processings due to different attributes of the renderings respectively, not only due to possibly different media for receiving the image data, but also due to alternative processings required for the image data for the renderings.

For example, independent claim 1 recites a job control system in a document processing system (e.g., Figure 5, 2; Fig. 6; Fig. 8) for a job including image data that has to be processed in "multiple alternative renderings" by first and second job processing events corresponding to first and second renderings. (For example, consider the first rendering to be the printing of the handouts of the presentation on white 20# letter stock paper, duplex printed and stapled, while the second rendering are slides on a transparent media as shown on "TICKET:HANDOUTS" and "TICKET:SLIDES" of Fig. 1.) The system includes an input source 52 (Fig. 5) for

programming (Fig. 2, 202, 204; paragraph 75) a first job control ticket (e.g., Fig. 7, 150; Fig. 1, Handout, Slides, Note Set or Proof Set; paragraphs 60, 61, 67, 68, 71) with the first set of attributes controlling the manner in which the job is processed as the first job processing event; and programming a second job control ticket (Fig. 1, e.g., Slides, Note Set Proof Set or Handouts; paragraphs 78; Fig. 2, 218, 220, 206) with the second set of attributes controlling the manner in which the job is to be processed for the second job processing event. (Figure 7 depicts an exemplary job programming ticket and job scorecard displayed on the user interface 52.) A master job control ticket (Fig. 1, paragraphs 67, 71, 75, 78, 92, 97) links user selectable global attributes (e.g., Fig. 1, Instructions) and user selectable individual ticket attributes (e.g., Fig. 1, QTY) to the first and second job control tickets wherein the global attributes comprise first properties applicable to both processing events. The first and second job control tickets also specify individual attributes comprising second properties individual to the job processing events, respectively, as described by the first and second control tickets. The first and second job processing events are based on and therefore include the same set of image data. FIG. 1 shows that the super ticket links global instructions to the individual tickets and that the page image data is also linked to individual tickets (e.g., Fig. 3, 228; Fig. 2, 206; paragraphs 76, 98, 99). The system further includes linking programs for linking the master job control ticket (e.g., paragraphs 46, 67, 71, 75, 78, 79) with the first and second job control tickets and the set of images (e.g., paragraphs 38, 41, 42) so that, with one submission of the job to the document processing subsystem, the job is processed (e.g., Fig. 4, 266, 268, 270; paragraphs 43, 91, 98, 99) in the first job processing event with the first job control ticket and the second job processing event with the second job control ticket so the same job data is

applied to the first and second job processing events under the control of the master job control ticket. Both processing events use the same set of image data and other user selected common ("global") job attributes to the first and second job processing events that are common to the corresponding renderings (e.g., Fig. 4, 270).

An exemplary embodiment of this system design is described at paragraphs [0071-0082], reference being made to the published Application 2002/0080402 A1.

Independent claim 28 recites a document processing system (e.g., Fig. 5, 2; Fig. 6, 6, 7, 8; Fig. 8, 170) comprising a first job control ticket of the first set of attributes for controlling the manner in which the job is to be processed in a first job processing event; a second job control ticket with a second set of attributes controlling a manner in which the job is to be processed in a second job processing event; and a master job control ticket (e.g., paragraphs 46, 67, 71, 75, 78, 79) for submitting as a single submission the image data linked to the first and second job control tickets for multiple alternative renderings (e.g., Fig. 4, 270) of the same set of image data. The global attributes are linked to the first and second job control tickets for affecting global properties of first and second job control tickets. The master job control ticket, the first job control ticket, the second job control ticket are linked with the set of image data comprising the job. In response to a single submission of the job to a document processing subsystem, the job is processed in the first job processing event with the first job control ticket and in the second job processing event with the second job control ticket based on the same set of image data.

Dependent claim 2 describes that the system includes first and second printers (paragraph 92) in a network and where a first copy of the image data is processed at

the first printer with the first job control ticket and a second copy of the image data is processed at the second printer with the second job control ticket.

Dependent claim 3 further describes a system of claim 1 to include an image capture device (Fig. 6, 6).

Dependent claim 4 further describes the system of claim 3 including a file generated from the image data set with the image capture device by reference to one of the first and second job control tickets and where the file is transmitted across the network to a memory (paragraph 96).

Dependent claim 5 further describes the system of claim 1 to include the first set of image processing operations to be performed on the image data in the first processing event (e.g., Fig. 4, 270) and a second set of image processing operations to be performed on the set of image data in the second processing event.

Dependent claim 6 further describes the system of claim 1 to include a first set of make-ready operations to be performed on a copy of the set of image data in the first job processing event and a second set of make-ready operations to be performed on a copy of the set of images in the second job processing event (paragraph 95).

Dependent claim 7 further describes the system of claim 1 to include an editing operation being performed on at least one of the first and second job control ticket (e.g., Fig. 3, 252).

Dependent claim 8 further describes the system of claim wherein the first and second job control tickets are configured so that the first set of attributes includes at least one attribute corresponding with a first type of offline finishing and/or the second set of attributes includes at least one attribute corresponding with a second type of offline finishing (paragraph 56).

Dependent claim 10 further describes the system of claim 1 wherein the master job control ticket includes a first user selectable portion corresponded with the first job control ticket and a second user selectable portion corresponded with the second job control ticket; and when the first user selectable portion is selected and the second user selectable portion is not, the job is processed in the first job processing event with the first job control ticket and not in the second job processing event with the second job control ticket (Fig. 7).

Dependent claim 11 further describes the system of claim 10 wherein the master job control ticket includes a third user selectable portion corresponded with a global instruction so when the first and second and third user selectable portions are selected, the global instruction is used to process the job in each the first job processing event and the second job processing event (paragraph 57).

Dependent claim 29 further describes the system of claim 28, wherein the data structure is embedded in the page description language of a file or document (paragraph 76).

Dependent claim 30 further describes the system of claim 28, in which the document processing subsystem communicates with said memory by way of a network, wherein the document processing subsystem is separated from said memory by the network (paragraph 97).

Dependent claim 31 further describes the system of claim 28, wherein the document processing subsystem includes first and second printers communicatively coupled with a network, and wherein a first copy of the image data is processed at the printer with the first job control ticket and a second copy of the image data is processed at the second printer with the second job control ticket (paragraph 97).

Dependent claim 32 further describes that the system of claim 31 comprises a xerographic printer.

Dependent claim 33 further describes the system of claim 28 to include an image capture device (Fig. 6, 6).

Dependent claim 34 further describes the system of claim 33, wherein a file is generated from the image data set with said image capture device by reference to one of the first and second job control tickets, and wherein the file is transmitted across the network to said memory (paragraph 97).

Dependent claim 35 further describes the system of claim 28, wherein a first set of one or more image processing operations is performed on a copy of the set of image data in the first job processing event and a second set of one or more image processing operations is performed on a copy of the set of image data in the second job processing event (paragraph 96).

Dependent claim 36 further describes the system of claim 28, wherein a first set of make-ready operations is performed on a copy of the set of image data in the first job processing event and a second set of make-ready operations is performed on a copy of the set of images in the second job processing event (paragraph 95).

Dependent claim 37 further describes the system of claim 28, wherein an editing operation is performed on at least one of the first and second job control tickets (e.g., Fig. 3, 252).

Dependent claim 38 further describes the system of claim 28, wherein the first and second job control tickets are configured so that the first set of attributes includes at least one attribute corresponding with a first type of offline finishing and/or the second

set of attributes includes at least one attribute corresponding with a second type of offline finishing (e.g., Fig. 6, 120)

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

The following grounds of rejection are presented for review:

Whether claims 1-8, 10-11 and 28-38 are unpatentable for failing to describe nonobvious subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,509,974 to Hansen, in view of U.S. patent Application Publication No. 2003/0103237 to Han.

(Regarding the Double Patenting Rejection, Applicant will overcome this rejection with a filing of a Terminal Disclaimer.)

VII. ARGUMENT

It is respectfully submitted that the references, either individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest methods or systems comprising a single submission of a job comprising multiple processings of alternative renderings as first and second job events wherein the same set of image data is applied to the first and second job processing events as shared image data or global attributes that comprise the first and second job processing events. Hansen describes a system for providing production printing instructions, i.e., a job ticket for a printed end document to a job preparation station. The printed document is described as comprising a plurality of documents of different content and document formatting. Hansen converts the plurality of constituent documents into a ready-for-printer format and merges the plurality of documents together to a single document in the ready-for-printer typed format. Hansen is not unlike Applicant's cited reference to Salgado et al. '762 (application, paragraph 50) with regard to the formation of a print job comprising a "composite job". Hansen calls it a "compound document". Hansen, col. 10, lines 45-50.

Hansen has no teaching with regard to multiple alternative renderings of the same job data, wherein the same job data is formatted differently to better accommodate the different needs of the job user. Keeping in mind the ultimate purpose of the subject application, i.e., the production of multiple distinct forms of a particular job without having to resubmit the job as a new and independent job for each of the distinct forms, Hansen lacks any teaching of a master job control ticket to effect the processing of the same job data in multiple renderings specifically defined in first, second or third job control tickets. Accordingly, there is no need for linking the first and second job

tickets to a master ticket, and thus there is no teaching or suggestion thereof. The Examiner correctly notes that Hansen teaches a job defining job ticket which can include global attributes for the plurality of documents comprising the composite job (e.g., common margins for the various documents being compounded in a book). However, there is no teaching that the global attributes should be included in a master job control ticket for multiple distinct renderings of the same image data. Each alternative rendering of the image data would have to be treated as a new job having its own job ticket which has to be resubmitted for independent processing with no linked or shared attributes or image data. Accordingly, the principal disadvantage in prior printing systems that is sought to be overcome in the embodiments of the subject application, i.e., a user having to resubmit any distinct renderings as a new job to the document processing, remains in the teachings of Hansen.

More particularly, Hansen describes the workflow management software for preparing and creating a print job for a compound document. Hansen exemplifies his compound document as a book comprised of the textual body of the book and photographs to be inserted at specific pages. Hansen, col. 4, lines 65-67. Such components of the compound document distinguishes different "documents of the job" that must be collected together. Such documents can be processed independently and can be represented by job tickets which are also suggested as being manipulatable such as by saving, storing and associating them with documents or compound documents. Hansen, col. 11, line 64- col. 12, line 30.

Figure 4 of Hansen discloses print jobs displayed on an interface as distinguishable items, i.e., document 1, book 1, document 4, book 2. These are different jobs comprised of different data each independently submitted and not "... first

and second job control tickets . . . linked to the set of image data . . .", claim 1. [To be fair, and despite the Examiner's remark referenced here, the Examiner later admits that Hansen ". . . does not expressly disclose there are multiple alternative renderings of the same set of image data.] (Final Office Action at page 8.) Accordingly, what is lacking from Hansen is multiple renderings of the same job data. Certainly, different jobs can have common formatting features and attributes which Hansen acknowledges in the industry are referred to as "global attributes" (Hansen, col. 12, line 2) but this is never identified as the same image data and is merely identified as formatting features. Note the description of "page tickets" at column 16, lines 37-46. Nowhere in Hansen is there a discussion of a job comprising either a document 1 or a book 1 or a book 2 that has to be rendered in different and alternative printing formats wherein the image data is stored and reused as job data for the different renderings. Note in application Figure 4, steps 264 and 266 there is a storage of (1) master ticket (2) job ticket(s) and (3) related image data and providing a link between (1), (2) and (3) as necessary in block 266.

In summary, Hansen discloses the type of prior art that Applicant acknowledges in his Background as conventional for generating compound documents with software workflow that is represented to the operator through a user interface so that the operator "can manage and prepare multiple different documents or jobs and keep everything organized in a simple and efficient manner." [Emphasis added] (Hansen, col. 16, line 27-29.)

Further to all the foregoing, Applicant and the Examiner agree that Hansen fails to disclose methods or systems for processing print jobs comprised of multiple alternative renderings of the same set of image data by applying same job data to first

and second job processing events. Thus, Han was applied as a teaching reference to Hansen to support the rejection.

Han was first cited in the final rejection and so Applicant and the Examiner have not had much discussion concerning the statements of this reference. Applicant's proposal to file an after final amendment on October 31, 2007 was not entered. Han, although extremely short in its description of embodiments, is not concerned with different renderings of the job data ("renderings" being distinct processing events of the "same image data" and global attributes, but with individual attributes too.). Han never suggests that the data renderings are independently processed, only that different media is used for the printing of the same job. The same job is formatted in one way, and just printed on different media, i.e., paper and a transparency. There are no distinctive individual job attributes between the mediums as both are the exact same image processing. There is no different processing events involved. Han fails to distinguish between different renderings associated with first and second job control tickets having first and second sets of attributes, respectively. As far as can be determined from the limited teachings of Han, the presentation mode instruction merely seems to adjust the print feeding unit to pull different and additional media from a different drawer. There is no linking of individual job tickets under a master job control ticket.

A combination of Hansen and Han suggests a unit that has a printer feeding unit with multiple mediums wherein for the same job multiple mediums can be fed to the marking unit for printing. The combination still lacks the important feature of a master job control ticket linking the same job data wherein alternative renderings of the same job data are programmed by a user for different renderings including different individual

ticket attributes and common global attributes, and wherein the master job control ticket links the individual first and second job control tickets in a manner so that the same job data applies to both the first and second job processing events, thereby avoiding multiple submissions of the job to document processing subsystems to accommodate the multiple renderings.

The Claims Define Nonobvious Subject Matter

Claim 1 recites a document processing system having an input source for programming first and second job control tickets for the same image data wherein the first and second job control tickets control different first and second job processing events. As noted above, Hansen fails to teach programming first and second job control tickets for the same job to be processed as multiple renderings. In Hansen every job is an independent rendering, even if it were to involve the same job data in different formats. Accordingly, there is no need or suggestion or teaching of a master job control ticket to link the first and second job control tickets with the image data for the job so that with only one submission of the job-to-document processing subsystem the same job data can be applied to both the first and second job processing events. Further, the linking is described as the master job control ticket being linked with both user selectable global attributes and user selectable individual ticket attributes to the first and second job control tickets wherein the global attributes comprise first properties of the first and second job control tickets and the individual attributes comprise second properties of a selected individual one of the first and second job control tickets. These limitations would never be needed and so are never suggested in either Hansen or Han individually or in combination. Whatever sharing of common attributes (i.e., margins,

medium stock, etc.) may be pulled down into different jobs in the workflow management system of Hansen or done independently with reference to each job, are selected without reference to a master job control ticket for multiple renderings of the same job. The advantage provided by the subject embodiment of facilitating a user to specify multiple renderings of a job by programming a master job control ticket and the individual job ticket associated with the individual renderings is not suggested or taught in the references individually or in combination. The efficiencies in obtaining the multiple renderings with such a programming, and the single submission of the job data remain as an advantage evidencing patentability of the novel claim features of claim 1.

Similarly, independent claim 28 also requires a first and second job control tickets linked by a master job control ticket wherein the master job control ticket includes user selectable global attributes and user selectable individual ticket attributes defining the multiple alternative renderings of the same set of image data. A system wherein the global attributes are linked to the first and second job control tickets for affecting global properties of the first and second job control tickets and individual attributes are linked for affecting individual properties of a selected individual one of the tickets defines novel and nonobvious features over the teachings of the references individually and in combination.

Dependent claim 2 adds a limitation to the system of claim 1 that the processing subsystem includes first and second printers communicatively coupled with the network, wherein the first copy of the image data is processed at the printer with the first job control ticket and a second copy of the image data is processed at the second printer with the second job control ticket. The patentability of claim 2 relies upon the novelty arguments above for claim 1.

Dependent claim 3 adds a limitation that the document processing subsystem includes an image capture device. The allowability of claim 3 relies upon the novelty arguments for claim 1.

Dependent claim 4 adds a limitation to the system of claim 3 that a file is generated from the image data set with the image capture device by reference to one of the first and second job control tickets, and where the file is transmitted across a network to a memory. The allowability of claim 4 relies upon the novelty arguments made above for claim 1.

Dependent claim 5 adds a limitation to the system of claim 1, wherein a first set of one or more image processing operations is performed on a copy of the set of image data in the first job processing event and a second set of one or more image processing operations is performed on a copy of the set of image data in the second job processing event. Different processing operations per processing event on the same image data, under the control of the master job control ticket is not shown in the references.

Dependent claim 6 adds a limitation to the system of claim 1, wherein a first set of make-ready operations is performed on a copy of the set of image data in the first job processing event and a second set of make-ready operations is performed on a copy of the set of images in the second job processing event.

Dependent claim 7 adds a limitation to the system of claim 1, wherein an editing operation is performed on at least one of the first and second job control tickets.

Dependent claim 8 adds a limitation to the system of claim 1, wherein the first and second job control tickets are configured so that the first set of attributes includes at least one attribute corresponding with a first type of offline finishing and/or the second

set of attributes includes at least one attribute corresponding with a second type of offline finishing.

The allowability of claims 6-9 relies upon the novelty arguments made above for claim 1.

Dependent claim 10 adds a limitation to the system of claim 1, wherein the master job control ticket includes a first user selectable portion corresponded with the first job control ticket and a second user selectable portion corresponded with the second job control ticket; and when the first user selectable portion is selected and the second user selectable portion is not, the job is processed in the first job processing event with the first job control ticket and not in the second job processing event with the second job control ticket. Claim 10 is novel in its recitation of a master job control ticket having a plurality of different processing events respectively corresponding with individual job tickets that may or may not be selected by the operator.

Dependent claim 11 adds a limitation to the system of claim 1, wherein the master job control ticket includes a third user selectable portion corresponded with a global instruction so that when the first second and third user selectable portions are selected, the global instruction is used to process the job in each the first job processing event and the second job processing event. Claim 11 rest on the novelty arguments for claim 1.

Dependent claim 29 adds a limitation to the system of claim 28, wherein the data structure is embedded in the page description language of a file or document.

Dependent claim 30 adds a limitation to the system of claim 28, in which the document processing subsystem communicates with said memory by way of a network,

wherein the document processing subsystem is separated from said memory by the network.

Dependent claim 31 adds a limitation to the system of claim 28, wherein the document processing subsystem includes first and second printers communicatively coupled with a network, and wherein a first copy of the image data is processed at the printer with the first job control ticket and a second copy of the image data is processed at the second printer with the second job control ticket.

Dependent claim 32 adds a limitation to the system of claim 31, wherein one of the first and second printers comprises a xerographic printer.

Dependent claim 33 adds a limitation to the system of claim 28, wherein the document processing subsystem includes an image capture device.

Dependent claim 34 adds a limitation to the system of claim 33, wherein a file is generated from the image data set with said image capture device by reference to one of the first and second job control tickets, and wherein the file is transmitted across the network to said memory.

Dependent claim 35 adds a limitation to the system of claim 28, wherein a first set of one or more image processing operations is performed on a copy of the set of image data in the first job processing event and a second set of one or more image processing operations is performed on a copy of the set of image data in the second job processing event.

Dependent claim 36 adds a limitation to the system of claim 28, wherein a first set of make-ready operations is performed on a copy of the set of image data in the first job processing event and a second set of make-ready operations is performed on a copy of the set of images in the second job processing event.

Dependent claim 37 adds a limitation to the system of claim 28, wherein an editing operation is performed on at least one of the first and second job control tickets.


Dependent claim 38 adds a limitation to the system of claim 28, wherein the first and second job control tickets are configured so that the first set of attributes includes at least one attribute corresponding with a first type of offline finishing and/or the second set of attributes includes at least one attribute corresponding with a second type of offline finishing.

Dependent claims 29-38 include limitations in combination with claim 28 that are not shown or suggested in the cited references.

CONCLUSION

For all of the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections are in error and that claims 1-8, 10, 11 and 28-38 are in condition for allowance. For all of the above reasons, Appellants respectfully request this Honorable Board to reverse the rejections of claims claims 1-8, 10, 11 and 28-38.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Patrick R. Roche", is written over a horizontal line.

Patrick R. Roche
Registration No. 29,580

PRR:ct

FAY SHARPE LLP
1100 Superior Avenue – Seventh Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
Telephone: (216) 861-5582

Filed: April 16, 2008

APPENDICES

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX:

Claims involved in the Appeal are as follows:

1. In a document processing system having a document processing subsystem in which a job, including a set of image data and a job control ticket, is processed each time the job, along with the job control ticket, is submitted to the document processing system, a job control system comprising:

a master job control ticket for controlling a manner in which the job is processed for multiple alternative renderings of the same set of image data in both a first job processing event and a second job processing event; and

an input source including a user interface with a display, the user interface being used to (a) program a first job control ticket with a first set of attributes, the first job control ticket controlling a manner in which the job is to be processed in a first job processing event, and (b) program a second job control ticket with a second set of attributes, the second job control ticket controlling a manner in which the job is to be processed in a second job processing event; and

a linking program, for linking the first and second job control tickets to the master job control ticket wherein a single submission of the job comprises a submission of the set of image data with the master job control ticket and causes the job to be processed as the first and second job processing events, wherein the master job control ticket has user selectable global attributes and user selectable individual ticket attributes within the master job control ticket, the global attributes comprising properties affecting all tickets under the master job control ticket and the individual attributes

comprising properties affecting only a selected ticket, and wherein the linking of the global and individual ticket attributes enables the processing of the first and second job processing events based on the same set of image data with the single submission of the job.

2. The job control system of claim 1, wherein the document processing subsystem includes first and second printers communicatively coupled with a network, and wherein a first copy of the image data is processed at the printer with the first job control ticket and a second copy of the image data is processed at the second printer with the second job control ticket.

3. The job control system of claim 1, wherein the document processing subsystem includes an image capture device.

4. The job control system of claim 3, wherein a file is generated from the image data set with said image capture device by reference to one of the first and second job control tickets, and where the file is transmitted across the network to a memory.

5. The job control system of claim 1, wherein a first set of one or more image processing operations is performed on a copy of the set of image data in the first job processing event and a second set of one or more image processing operations is performed on a copy of the set of image data in the second job processing event.

6. The job control system of claim 1, wherein a first set of make-ready operations is performed on a copy of the set of image data in the first job processing event and a second set of make-ready operations is performed on a copy of the set of images in the second job processing event.

7. The job control system of claim 1, wherein an editing operation is performed on at least one of the first and second job control tickets.

8. The job control system of claim 1, wherein the first and second job control tickets are configured so that the first set of attributes includes at least one attribute corresponding with a first type of offline finishing and/or the second set of attributes includes at least one attribute corresponding with a second type of offline finishing.

9. (Cancelled)

10. The job control system of claim 1, wherein,
the master job control ticket includes a first user selectable portion corresponded with the first job control ticket and a second user selectable portion corresponded with the second job control ticket; and

when the first user selectable portion is selected and the second user selectable portion is not, the job is processed in the first job processing event with the first job control ticket and not in the second job processing event with the second job control ticket.

11. The job control system of claim 10, wherein,

the master job control ticket includes a third user selectable portion corresponded with a global instruction so that when the first second and third user selectable portions are selected, the global instruction is used to process the job in each the first job processing event and the second job processing event.

12-27. (Cancelled)

28. A document processing system having document processing subsystem in which a job, including a set of image data and a job control ticket, is processed each time the job, along with the job control ticket, is submitted to the document processing system, comprising:

a memory;

a master job control ticket for controlling the job as both a first job processing event and a second job processing event for multiple alternative renderings of the same set of image data;

a first job control ticket with a first set of attributes, the first job control ticket controlling a manner in which the job is to be processed in the first job processing event;

a second job control ticket with a second set of attributes, the second job control ticket controlling a manner in which the job is to be processed in the second job processing event; and

wherein the set of image data is linked to both the first and second job control tickets so that a single submission of the set of image data with the master job control ticket causes the job to be processed in the first job processing event with the first job control ticket and in the second job processing event with the second job control ticket, and wherein the job need not be submitted multiple times to the document processing subsystem, wherein the master job control ticket has user selectable global attributes and user selectable individual ticket attributes within the master job control ticket, the global attributes comprise properties affecting all tickets under the master job control ticket and the individual attributes comprising properties affecting a selected ticket and not all of the tickets under the master job control ticket, and wherein the linking of the global and individual ticket attributes enables the processing of the first and second job processing events based on the same set of image data with the single submission of the job.

29. The document processing system of claim 28, wherein the data structure is embedded in the page description language of a file or document.

30. The document processing system of claim 28, in which the document processing subsystem communicates with said memory by way of a network, wherein the document processing subsystem is separated from said memory by the network.

31. The document processing system of claim 28, wherein the document processing subsystem includes first and second printers communicatively

coupled with a network, and wherein a first copy of the image data is processed at the printer with the first job control ticket and a second copy of the image data is processed at the second printer with the second job control ticket.

32. The document processing system of claim 31, wherein one of the first and second printers comprises a xerographic printer.

33. The document processing system of claim 28, wherein the document processing subsystem includes an image capture device.

34. The document processing system of claim 33, wherein a file is generated from the image data set with said image capture device by reference to one of the first and second job control tickets, and wherein the file is transmitted across the network to said memory.

35. The document processing system of claim 28, wherein a first set of one or more image processing operations is performed on a copy of the set of image data in the first job processing event and a second set of one or more image processing operations is performed on a copy of the set of image data in the second job processing event.

36. The document processing system of claim 28, wherein a first set of make-ready operations is performed on a copy of the set of image data in the first job

processing event and a second set of make-ready operations is performed on a copy of the set of images in the second job processing event.

37. The document processing system of claim 28, wherein an editing operation is performed on at least one of the first and second job control tickets.

38. The document processing system of claim 28, wherein the first and second job control tickets are configured so that the first set of attributes includes at least one attribute corresponding with a first type of offline finishing and/or the second set of attributes includes at least one attribute corresponding with a second type of offline finishing.

39-49 (Cancelled)

IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

NONE

- X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX
NONE